

MADIZA FALLÉN, 1810 (DIPTERA, MILICHIIDAE): PROPOSED  
DESIGNATION OF TYPE-SPECIES, UNDER THE PLENARY  
POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 2040

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Agricultural  
Research Service, USDA*<sup>1</sup>)

The dipterous genus *Madiza* was briefly diagnosed by Fallén (1810 : 19) based on three unnamed species ("Sp. Sv. 3" = Species Sveciae 3). In 1820, Fallén described the genus with five new species: *laevigata*, *oscinina*, *glabra*, *pinguis*, and *sordida*, in that order, with no clue as to which were the original three. No type-species was fixed. The first two species are now in the family CHLOROPIDAE, the third and fifth in MILICHIIDAE, and the fourth in AGROMYZIDAE. Strictly interpreted, *Madiza* is a chloropid, but through a combination of circumstances, overwhelming usage has long considered it a milichiid. The purpose of this application is to request that its milichiid placement be confirmed by designation, under the plenary powers, of *Madiza glabra* Fallén as the type-species.

2. Macquart (1835 : 584) proposed a new genus *Siphonella* for three new species and *Madiza oscinina* Fallén, which he designated as the type-species, and this genus is universally accepted in the CHLOROPIDAE. Rondani (1856 : 128), surely not in ignorance of Macquart's proposal, designated *M. oscinina* as the type-species of *Madiza*, and this is, unfortunately, the earliest valid designation of a type-species for *Madiza*. It was accepted as such by Coquillett (1910), Malloch (1913), and a few other chiefly American authors, and it is the basis for the slight amount of usage of *Madiza* in the CHLOROPIDAE. On the other hand, Hendel (1903 : 251, 1910 : 307) concluded on the basis of his principle of elimination that *M. glabra* was the type-species and that the name *Madiza* belonged in the family MILICHIIDAE ("Madiza Fall. 1810. Von den drei Arten wurden zwei durch *Siphonella* Macqu. 1835 absorbent, so dass der Fallensche Name für *M. glabra* zu gelten hat."—Hendel, 1910 : 307).

3. In 1941 I published "An annotated list of genotypes of the Chloropidae of the world," in which I concluded that "*Madiza* and *Siphonella* are isogenotypic and therefore absolute synonyms" because the oldest valid type designations for those nominal genera had picked *M. oscinina* Fallén, a chloropid. Because *Madiza* was consistently used in Europe as a milichiid, I published a short explanation of my conclusion in an English journal, and this led to a mutually unconvincing exchange with J. E. Collin (Sabrosky, 1942, 1943; Collin, 1942, 1943). Collin argued that *oscinina* was not one of the three unnamed species upon which Fallén founded the genus in 1810, that it was obvious that the 1820 description was expanded "to include the newly discovered species *oscinina*", and, based on his particular interpretation of Opinion 46, that *oscinina* could not be the type-species of *Madiza* because "it does not agree with the original generic publication", and that therefore Rondani's

---

<sup>1</sup>Mail address: c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560.

designation of *ascinina* was invalid and Hendel's selection of *glabra* must be accepted. Incidentally, in the face of Collin's stout contention that *ascinina* was not one of the three original but then unnamed species, study of the Fallén Collection in the Naturhistoriska Riksmuseet in Stockholm in 1953 revealed an interesting bit of evidence. Under *Madiza*, the name labels for the first three species, *laevigata*, *ascinina*, and *glabra* in the same sequence as published, are on the same kind of paper with the same now pale ink. The last two species, *pinguis* and *sordida*, are on a different kind of paper and in blacker ink. This bears out my belief that *ascinina* was indeed one of the original three species. Fallén must have added the last two between 1810 and 1820.

4. Nevertheless, regardless of the merits of the arguments of Sabrosky and Collin, the question of whether *ascinina* did or did not come under the original generic description is nomenclaturally irrelevant, and certainly so now that Opinion 46 has been cancelled and the new Code has more precise rules for genera proposed without species included by name. The case of *Madiza* falls under Article 69a(ii) of the Code: "If no nominal species were included at the time the genus was established, the nominal species-group taxa that were first subsequently and expressly referred to it are to be treated as the only originally included species". Item (3) under that subsection specifies that "If two or more nominal species were simultaneously referred to a nominal genus, all are equally eligible for subsequent type-designation". Hence the five species described by Fallén (1820) are to be treated as the originally included species. The first valid designation of an originally included species was that of Rondani (1856), who chose *ascinina*. Under the code, therefore, *Madiza* belongs in the family CHLOROPIDAE.

5. Taxonomists in general had not accepted *Madiza* as a chloropid, however, partly because Macquart had established the genus *Siphonella* for *ascinina*, and this was widely accepted, and partly, in this country, because of the prestige of Hendel and the acceptance of his conclusion that *glabra* was the real type of *Madiza*. With few exceptions, *Madiza* has been used for an extremely common genus in the family MILICHIIDAE. It has been used, for example in such general and influential works as Lindner's "Die Fliegen der paläarktischen Region" (Milichiidae by W. Hennig, 1937), the Faune de France (Milichiidae by Seguy, 1934), faunal series in the USSR, and Kloet and Hincks' "Check List of British Insects (1945)". In "A Catalog of the Diptera of America North of Mexico" (1965), I adopted *Madiza* in the MILICHIIDAE in the interests of stability and universality, but with a note that Suspension of the Rules would be required. This same course is being followed in catalogues of Diptera of the Neotropical, Oriental and Ethiopian Regions now in preparation.

6. *Madiza* in the MILICHIIDAE has been the basis of the subfamily name MADIZINAE Czerny (1909 : 278) one of the two subfamilies into which the family is customarily divided (or three if one includes the CARNINAE).

7. Accordingly, the Commission is requested

- (1) to exercise its plenary powers to suppress all previous type fixations for *Madiza* Fallén, 1810, and to designate *Madiza glabra* Fallén, 1820, as type-species;

- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic *Madiza* Fallén, 1810 (gender : feminine), type-species *Madiza glabra* Fallén, 1820, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology *glabra* Fallén, 1820, as published in the binomen *Madiza glabra* Fallén (type-species of *Madiza* Fallén, 1810); and
- (4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology MADIZINAE Czerny, 1909 (type-genus *Madiza* Fallén, 1810).

## LITERATURE CITED

- COLLIN, J. E. 1942. *Entomologist's Mon. Mag.* 78 : 171-2  
 — 1943. *Ibid.* 79 : 107-108  
 COQUILLET, D. W. 1910. *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.* 37 : 499-647  
 CZERNY, L., in CZERNY and STROBL. 1909. *Verh. zool.-Bot. Ges. Wien.* 59 : 121-301  
 FALLÉN, C. F. 1810. *Specim. entomolog. novam Diptera disponendi methodum exhibens.* 26 pp. Lund  
 — 1820. *Oscinides Sveciae.* 10 pp. Lund.  
 HENDEL, F. 1903. *Wien. ent. Ztg.* 22 : 249-252.  
 — 1910. *Ibid.* 29 : 307-313  
 MACQUART, J. 1835. *Histoire naturelle des Diptères.* Vol. 2, 703 pp.  
 MALLOCH, J. R. 1913. *Can. Ent.* 45 : 175-178  
 RONDANI, C. 1856. *Dipterologiae Italicae prodromus.* Vol. 1, 228 pp.  
 SABROSKY, C. W. 1941. *Anns. ent. Soc. Amer.* 34 : 735-765  
 — 1942. *Entomologist's mon. Mag.* 78 : 169-171  
 — 1943. *Ibid.* 79 : 106-107

